

Erika Juhász

*Scelus nomine Andreas Darmarius scriptor et veterator nequissimus**

In the study of the manuscripts of the classical and Byzantine authors the name of Andreas Darmarios emerges several times. In their book on medieval and Renaissance scribes published in 1909 Marie Vogel and Victor Gardthausen collected more than 300 manuscripts that were partly or completely prepared by Darmarios.¹ The list is not complete, and as it has been proven, the authors were wrong in some cases. However, the number is still astonishing. The number of those manuscripts that were not transcribed by Darmarios is even higher, but he still had an important role in their provenience as bookseller.

In the specialized literature his name usually emerges only in connection with different authors he copied.² Although some shorter papers were published on him in the 19th century, the information they contain has become outdated or needs correction.³ No monograph has been published on him so

* The paper has been prepared with the financial help of the following research projects: OTKA NN 104456 and The Austrian Science Fund (FWF) P25485 "The Chronicon Paschale. Critical Edition and Enhanced Edition Method".

¹ VOGEL, M. – GARDTHAUSEN, V.: Die griechischen Schreiber des Mittelalters und der Renaissance. *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen. Beiheft* 33 (1909) 16–27. [Repr. Hildesheim 1966.]

² Some examples: BROWNING, R.: The So-Called Tzetzes Scholia on Philostratus and Andreas Darmarios. *CQ* (New Series) 5 (1955) 195–200; KRESTEN, O.: Andreas Darmarios und die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Pseudo-Julios Polydeukes. *JÖB* 18 (1969) 137–165; SOSOWER, M. L.: A Forger Revisited: Andreas Darmarios and Beinecke 269. *JÖB* 43 (1993) 289–306; FUENTES GONZÁLEZ, P. P.: Andrés Darmario, Copista en Granada de Alejandro de Afrodisiade. *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 61 (1999) 719–728; LEVERENZ L.: Two Darmarios Manuscripts of Scholia on Oppian's "Halieutica". *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge* 142 (1999) 345–358; MARTÍNEZ MANZANO T.: Die Aufenthalte des Andreas Darmarios in Madrid und Salamanca und ihre Bedeutung für die „Recensio“ der Philostrate- und Oppianscholien. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge* 151 (2008) 400–424.

³ VOGEL, E. G.: Verzeichniss griechischer Abschreiber aus dem IX–XVI. Jahrhunderte, nach datierten Handschriften. *Serapeum* 5 (1844) 273–288, esp. 277–282; VOGEL, E. G.: Noch Einiges über Andr. Darmarius und Ant. Eparchus. *Serapeum* 7 (1846) 254–256; SCHMIDT, L.: Andreas Darmarius. Ein Beitrag zur Handschriftenkunde des 16. Jahrhunderts. *Centralblatt*

far. In his PhD thesis defended in 1967, Otto Kresten attempted to outline the main phases of Darmarios' life on the basis of the written sources (primarily on the basis of the manuscripts copied by Darmarios) and he also analysed his manuscripts on palaeographical and codicological grounds. However, the thesis has never been published. I mainly use the data found in this thesis regarding the biographical facts and the statistical analysis of the Darmarios manuscripts.⁴ The following biography can be reconstructed from the data gained from the manuscripts and from other written sources:

Andreas Darmarios was born in 1540 in Monembasia (in Epidauros Limera), a town on the Peloponnese.⁵ According to his subscriptions his father was called Georgios. He got his linguistic education from Dorotheos of Nauplion in Sparta, and allegedly at that time he had already been engaged in the transcription and sale of manuscripts.⁶

According to his subscription in his first dated manuscript (*Codex Vaticanus Graecus* 2349) in 1559 he was already in Rome. In the subsequent years he also visited Padua and Venice, then at the end of 1562 he arrived in Trent, a significant station of his life, where the last phase of the council was taking place. In Trent he got in touch with Spanish ecclesiastical dignities and he gained such important patrons as for instance Diego de Covarrubias (later Bishop of Segovia) or Antonio Agustín, Bishop of Lleida and later Archbishop of Tarragona.

He got married in 1564 in Venice, and possibly his first child, a son was also born this time. Presumably he returned to Venice to his family again and again from his trading trips.

für Bibliothekswesen 3 (1886) 129–136., who mainly summarized Charles Graux's statements (Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l' Escorial. *Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études* 46 [1880] 287–297, et passim).

⁴ KRESTEN, O.: *Der Schreiber Andreas Darmarios. Eine kodikologisch-paläographische Studie. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Wien*. Wien 1967.

⁵ Among the sources on Darmarios' life, the German philologist, Martin Krauß's (*Martin Crusius*) letters, diary and historical work are of special importance (*Annales Suevici sive Chronica rerum gestarum antiquissimae et inclytæ Suevicæ gentis*. Frankfurt 1595). Numerous quotations from the latter ones can be found in MYSTAKIDES, B. A.: Μαρτίνοσ ὁ Κρούσιος καὶ Ἀνδρέας Δαρμάριος ὁ Ἐπιδαύριος ἐν Τυβίγγῃ 1584. In *Forschungen und Versuche zur Geschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit. Festschrift Dietrich Schäfer zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht von seinen Schülern*. Jena 1915, 500–526. According to the entry in Karuß's diary dated to 1584: "Ait se [Darmarius] 44 annorum aetatem habere". (*Crusius, Diarium* III, 895; MYSTAKIDES 512).

⁶ LEGRAND, E.: Notice biographique sur Jean et Théodose Zygomalas. *Publications de l'école des langues orientales vivantes, III^e série*, 6/2 (1889) 67–264. 254.: "Ait (sc. Darmarius) se noctu surgere, libros legere (quorum et multos sua manu describit, ac vendit cum aliis) et ita linguam alere."

We have sources on his first provable business trip to Augsburg in 1566. From then onwards he kept on going on business trips almost all his lifetime; he visited numerous cities in Europe. He did not usually prepare the books he offered to sell alone; he rather ran a scriptorium.

At the end of the 1560's he travelled in the Low Countries with three of his colleagues to buy manuscripts, but he was captured by Flemish soldiers and he lost his fortune. Lacking money, he attempted to sell his books at a higher price, in vain.

From 1570 we can find Darmarios in Spain: he subscribed and dated his first manuscript (*Cod. Matrit. Pal.* 25) there to 16 June 1570, in Lleida, at the residence of Bishop Antonio Agustín. On 23 November 1570 Agustín introduced Darmarios to Jerónimo Zurita y Castro (1512–1580, Hieronymus Zurita), the famous Aragonese scholar.⁷ At the beginning of 1571 Darmarios had sold codices to the Escorial library. In the next three years he visited Venice several times, and in spring 1573 he returned to Spain (to Lleida). With the help of Zurita, Agustín managed to arrange that Darmarios could copy manuscripts from the stock of the still closed Escorial library.

We can find no indication of place in his manuscripts dated to 1575 and 1576; it is even more astonishing that in autumn 1576 he subscribed two copies in prison. Some state that he was incarcerated due to his counterfeiting,⁸ but according to Kresten it is more probable that Darmarios only committed a minor offence,⁹ and on the basis of a manuscript dated to 18 June 1577 in Madrid he did not spend much time in prison. In the subsequent years he usually commuted between the Spanish Kingdom and Venice; in the middle of the 1580's he still sold manuscripts in the German cities. In 1587 he presumably managed to sell books once for the Escorial library,¹⁰ but as a scribe – primarily due to counterfeiting the titles – he lost his credit and could not sell manuscripts in Spain any more. After 1587 we have no data about him; the year of his death is also unknown.

The persons and places mentioned above are also important regarding the history of the research on the Paschal Chronicle, since in the 16th century

⁷ GRAUX (n. 3) 292.

⁸ LUNDSTRÖM, V.: Studien zu spätgriechischen und byzantinischen Chroniken. *Eranos* 1 (1896) 150–168. 164: "Obgleich er während der Zwischenzeit, zweifelsohne seiner Fälschungen wegen, die Gefängnisluft genossen hatte, ist er jetzt als Titelfälscher frecher als jemals."

⁹ KRESTEN (n. 4) 38–39.

¹⁰ DE ANDRÉS, G.: Una venta desconocida de códicos griegos hecha por Andrés Darmarios en Espana en 1587. *La Ciudad de Dios* 178 (1965) 118–127, esp. 121.

Darmarios prepared three copies of the text preserved in the 10th century *codex unicus* possessed by Jerónimo Zurita y Castro at that time and now kept in the Vatican Library.¹¹

According to Andreas Darmarios' subscriptions at the end of the manuscripts, the *Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 was completed on 1 July 1573 in Lleida;¹² the *Codex Holmiensis Graecus* Va. 7,1-2 was completed on 1 October 1573 in Madrid,¹³ while the *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus* n. 2 was finished on 18 February 1579,¹⁴ but the place of the transcription was not indicated. On the basis of these subscriptions it was assumed that the Munich copy was completed first, then the Stockholm copy followed and the Uppsala manuscript was copied last. The data in the subscriptions have not been questioned by the researchers so far, but Peter Schreiner pointed out in his edition of the fragments of the Megas Chronographos¹⁵ that some questions seemed unanswerable on the basis of the dating of the manuscripts.

Beside the text of the Paschal Chronicle the *Codex Vaticanus Graecus* 1941 also contains other texts partly copied by the 10th-century scribe and partly added later on the blank pages. However, the *Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 dated as the first contains the least of these texts. The other two copies now kept in Sweden retained more passages from the texts interpolated to the Paschal Chronicle, but differences can be found between the two versions.

On f. 1^v in the *Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 we can only read a short passage that originates from the text preceding the Paschal Chronicle in the Vatican manuscript (*Syntagma de Paschalibus*). Here we can read shorter or longer passages from several authors on calculating Easter – these texts were

¹¹ *Codex Vaticanus Graecus* 1941. See: CANART, P.: *Codices Vaticani Graeci. Codices 1745-1962. I-II*. Vatican 1970, I, 715–718; 738; II, LXVI–LXVII.

¹² See: HARDT, I.: *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Graecorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bavaricae. Monachii* 1812, 416–417.

¹³ See: TORALLAS TOVAR, S.: De codicibus Graecis Upsaliensibus olim Escorialensibus *Erytheia*. *Revista de Estudios Byzantinos y Neogriegos* 15 (1994) 252–256.

¹⁴ See: TORALLAS TOVAR (n. 13) 196–204.

¹⁵ The Stockholm codex contains several fragments from the Megas Chronographos that cannot be found in the Munich manuscript. In relation to this issue Peter Schreiner writes the following: "Da der Monacensis die Notizen aus dem *megas chronographos* nicht enthält und dem kodikologischen Befund nach auch nie enthalten haben kann, ergibt sich für die Darmarios-Forschung das Problem, ob auch für eine weitere Kopie das Original zur Vorlage diente oder Darmarios es dafür nochmals zur Kontrolle heranzog und die bei der ersten Kopie vergessenen Notizen gesondert nachtrug. Dieses Verhalten wäre in beiden Fällen gleichermaßen ungewöhnlich." (SCHREINER, P.: *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken. I. [Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Vindobonensis* 12,1] Wien 1975, 38.)

copied by the 10th-century scribe before the chronicle due to their close relatedness to the Paschal Chronicle.¹⁶ The first folio (the fifth leaf in the codex) was seriously damaged; the text can hardly be deciphered. We know that the first quotation is from Philon, then the name of Petrus Alexandrinus appears in the left margin of the verso. The text becomes legible only from the middle of f. 6^r, and from then onwards it can be easily read up to f. 18^v. However, in the *Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 only the last paragraph of the introductory text is legible, above in the first line we can find the name of Petros Alexandreias written in red ink in an abbreviated form.

It is on f. 2^r where the text of the Paschal Chronicle starts with the following title also present in the Vatican manuscript: 'Επιτομή χρόνων τῶν ἀπὸ ἀδάμ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου ἀνθρώπου· ἕως κ' ἔτους τῆς βασιλείας ἡρακλείου τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου· καὶ μετὰ ὑπατεῖαν ἔτους ιθ'· καὶ ιη' ἔτους τῆς βασιλείας ἡρακλείου νέου· κωνσταντίνου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ· ἰνδικτίονος γ'. The text of the chronicle ends with line 11 on f. 773^r. From the end of the Vatican manuscript presumably some text occupying one or two leaves was lost, and the last folio preserved is seriously damaged; Darmarios did not attempt to decipher the fragmentary text, he noticed after the last line that the text is mutilated due to its antiquity. On f. 773^v Darmarios' subscription can be read, and at the end of the codex we can find six blank leaves (where the folio numbering continues up to 779).

Darmarios copied the full text of the *Syntagma de Paschalibus* from f. 1^r up to f. 30^v in the *Codex Holmiensis Graecus* Va. 7,1-2, starting from the point where the text becomes legible within the quotation from Petrus Alexandrinus. At the top of the first page he presented the remark taken from the left margin of the Vatican manuscript as title, written in red ink (Πέτρου ἐπισκόπου 'Αλεξανδρείας καὶ μάρτυρος, ὅτι ἀπλανῶς ἔταξεν (sic) οἱ 'Εβραῖοι τὴν ιδ' τοῦ α' μηνὸς τῆς σελήνης ὡς (sic) τῆς ἀλώσεως τῶν 'Ιεροσολύμων).

The Paschal Chronicle starts with the usual title 'Επιτομή χρόνων... on f. 31^r and it ends on f. 796^v. (The Stockholm codex consists of two volumes, but the numbering of the folios started in the first volume continues in the second volume.) The fragmentary ending of the chronicle cannot be found here, either; we can only read Darmarios' remark telling us that the text was mutilated. The subscription was written on the next page, on f. 797^r.

¹⁶ About the relationship of the *Syntagma de Paschalibus* and the *Chronicon Paschale* (together with the French translation of the *Syntagma*) see: BEAUCAMP, J. – BONDOUX, R. CL. – LEFORT, J. – ROUAN-AUZÉPY, M. FR. – SORLIN, I.: Temps et histoire I : Le prologue de la chronique pasquale. *Travaux et Mémoires* 7 (1979) 223–301.

The verso of this leaf remained blank, but on ff. 798^r–799^r Darmarios copied three fragments from the *Codex Vaticanus Graecus* 1941 that do not belong to the Paschal Chronicle and were only added later in the blank spaces. Out of the fragments attributed to the so-called Megas Chronographos thirteen can be read on ff. 241^v and 242^r (in the Vatican manuscript), and a further one was placed on f. 242^v.¹⁷ Out of the first thirteen Darmarios copied the first two and the last one, then he copied the separate 14th fragment of the Megas Chronographos on f. 800^{f-v} after leaving f. 799^v blank. Below this in the Vatican manuscript one can observe the activity of a third hand, as well as a list of the nine muses, which also copied by Darmarios on the next page (f. 801^r).

In contrast to what we have seen before, the first page (1^r) of the *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus* n. 2 seems to be rather disordered. The name of the author Πέτρου ἐπισκόπου ἀλεξανδρείας καὶ μάρτυρος is indicated in red ink in the first line; then from line 2 it is followed by the title of the Paschal Chronicle (Ἐπιτομὴ χρόνων...) in red ink, but the title is not followed by the chronicle; instead, we can read the last paragraph of the *Syntagma de Paschalibus* there. The actual text of the Paschal Chronicle starts only on f. 1^v, but before the *incipit* the words ἀρχὴ τῆς χρονικῆς διηγήσεως are inserted in red ink. The text of the chronicle ends on f. 495^r, where it is indicated in the usual way that the text is mutilated.

The subscription can be found on the back of the f. 495. From the next folio, i.e. from f. 496, almost the complete text of the *Syntagma de Paschalibus* can be read: Darmarios left out the illegible part from the beginning here as well, and he did not repeat the last paragraph he had already copied on the first page. The text ends on f. 520^v with the closing formula τέλος σὺν Θεῷ ἀγίῳ | ἀμήν, but the folio numbering there is confused.

Based on what has been said above, the former standpoint regarding the relationship of the manuscripts cannot be sustained, and Darmarios possibly did not copy the further manuscripts from the Munich copy, which was allegedly completed first.

A possible starting point is to question the credibility of Darmarios' subscription, which might not be an extremely bold assumption in the light of what has been presented at the beginning of the paper.

In dating manuscripts one needs to consider several different viewpoints: both the palaeographical and the codicological analyses are essential. However,

¹⁷ To the fragments of the Megas Chronographos see: SCHREINER, P.: *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken. I-III. (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae. Series Vindobonensis 12,1-3)* Wien 1975, 37–39; 1977, 70–87; 1979, 11–15.; WHITBY, L. M.: *The Great Chronographer and Theophanes. Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 8 (1982–1983) 1–20.

in this case, the textual critical analysis seems to be useful. In what follows we attempt to establish the right order of the manuscripts through the collation of some passages.

First of all, it is worth collating the lacunas and the interpolations in the single copies. In the Vatican manuscript apart from the items mentioned earlier, two further fragments can be read from the *Megas Chronographos* that were inserted in the margin, next to the related passage. The two fragments can be found in all the three copies by Darmarios in the main text, inserted at the same place. On f. 140^v the hand copying the *Megas Chronographos* fragments also added a list of Roman emperors to the text of the chronicle that appears in the main text of the copies, indicated with a title in red ink and written in continuation of the main text.

The difference is straightforward in the passage discussing the history of the kings of Israel and the Kingdom of Judah: while the 10th-century scribe discussed the kings on the opposing pages in a parallel way (*Codex Vaticanus Graecus* 1941 ff. 72^v–90^r), Darmarios presented the kings of the two dynasties alternately in all the three manuscripts he copied (*Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 ff. 155^r–201^r; *Codex Holmiensis Graecus* Va. 7,1-2 ff. 184^r–230^r; *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus* n. 2 ff. 96^r–125^v).

Among the lacunas we might mention that on f. 206^v in the Vatican manuscript we can find the names of the consuls of the second and third years in the 278th Olympiad (Δαλμάτου καὶ Ζηνοφίλου and Ὀπτάτου Πατρικίου καὶ Ἀνικίου Παυλίνου), while in all the three copies we can only read the first and the last names: Δαλμάτου καὶ Ἀνικίου Παυλίνου (*Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 f. 539^{rv}; *Codex Holmiensis Graecus* Va. 7,1-2 f. 565^v; *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus* n. 2 f. 344^v). However, the most characteristic lacuna can be observed in Emperor Justinian's decree. From the decree quoted in full length in the Vatican codex (from f. 249^r) a two-page long part is missing in all the three copies (*Codex Monacensis Graecus* 557 f. 681^r; *Codex Holmiensis Graecus* Va. 7,1-2 f. 703^v; *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus* n. 2 f. 436^v). This phenomenon can be interpreted as a simple scribal error: after copying f. 257^r Darmarios turned two pages at once by accident and he continued the transcription with the first word of f. 258^v instead of f. 257^v. He did not realize that the text became incomprehensible this way (or he did not have the opportunity correct his error), and he retained the damaged text in the later copies as well.

Although we can find further parallels in the manuscripts, we can claim even on the basis of the examples presented above that all the three manuscripts

originate from the Vatican codex, and it seems that the three copies were not prepared independently on the basis of the Vatican original. However, an analysis of further passages is needed to establish the order of their transcription.

Primarily the disjunctive errors (or possibly the corrections) can help us. The seemingly insignificant mistakes can also be informative; e.g. on f. 221^v in the Vatican manuscript we can find the dating *πρὸ δ' ἰδὼν ἱανουαρίων*, which is present in the Stockholm codex (f. 606^r) in a correct form, while from the Munich (f. 583^r) and Uppsala manuscripts (f. 374^r) the word *ἰδὼν* was left out.

In the majority of the cases Darmarios copied the texts mechanically, but sometimes he attempted to correct the passages of the original text he found wrong. We can find an example for this case in the copies of the passage in lines 14–15 on f. 139^v in the Vatican manuscript. The name of Ptolemaios was inserted incorrectly to the original sentence (*ἀρχὴ γαῖου ἰουλίου καίσαρος· καὶ πομπηίου πτολεμαίου τοῦ καὶ λεπίδου*), thus the structure *πτολεμαίου τοῦ καὶ λεπίδου* was formed, which was corrected by Darmarios to *Πτολεμαῖον καὶ τοῦ Λεπίδου*, which seems to be a better solution, but it still does not eliminate the error. However, this passage is important to us because the correction appears only in the Munich (f. 335^v) and Uppsala (f. 209^v) manuscripts, while the Stockholm codex (f. 366^r) still contains the original version. However, two lacunas are still more convincing: the four years of the 297th Olympiad and the beginning of the first year of the 298th Olympiad (*Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1941* f. 222^v) are missing from the Munich and Uppsala manuscripts (*Codex Monacensis Graecus 557* f. 585^v; *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus n. 2* f. 375^v), whereas the Stockholm codex (ff. 608^v–609^r) follows the Vatican original closely. The same can be observed in the discussion of the 350th Olympiad (*Codex Vaticanus Graecus* ff. 280^{rv}), where the description of two years was left out from the Munich (f. 744^v) and Uppsala manuscripts (f. 477^v), while the Stockholm codex seems to be complete compared to the *codex unicus* (ff. 768^v–769^r).

Based on what has been said above, it seems that Darmarios prepared the *Codex Holmiensis Graecus* Va. 7, 1–2 first out of the three copies. Consequently, the dates in the subscriptions can also be questioned.¹⁸

Our sources do not inform us about incidents due to counterfeited subscriptions, although Darmarios was heavily criticized by his contemporaries for

¹⁸ To establish the relationship between the *Codex Monacensis Graecus 557* and the *Codex Upsaliensis Graecus n. 2* it is necessary to examine further passages and to carry out a codicological analysis, which are to be discussed in a separate paper.

counterfeiting titles. Darmarios fell under suspicion also because of the copies of the Paschal Chronicle: as we could see, at the beginning of the Munich manuscript and in the Uppsala codex prepared for Philip II on the first page he indicated the name of Peter of Alexandria, because he was in fact the source of the quotation following the title. However, his remark was later reinterpreted as if he had named Petrus Alexandrinus as the author of the Paschal Chronicle. On f. 31^r in the Stockholm manuscript copied for Antonio Agustín Darmarios wrote the following: οἶμαι εἶναι Μαρκελλίνου ἢ Ἰππολύτου ἐπιτομὴν – this statement was later regarded as a fact by the compilers of manuscript catalogues. After Agustín's death this copy also became part of the stock of the Escorial, where for some time it was not realized that both manuscripts contain the Paschal Chronicle, whose author is in fact unknown. However, during the reorganization of the library the identity of the manuscripts was revealed, and David Colville, the librarian of the Escorial severely scolded Darmarios in the margin of f. 31 in the Stockholm manuscript:

scelus Darm[ari] | tune idem scrip[sisti tua manu | in II. Θ. 20. | esse
Petri | Alexandrini | cum nullius ex | tribus esse | possit, cum long[e]
| antiquiores | sint.

In the Uppsala manuscript in f. 1^r he wrote:

Darma[ri] | scelus a[tque] | pecus pe[ssi]mu(m), tun[e] | scripsist[i]
| manu tua | propria [in] | V. Θ. 20 p[ag.] | 31 esse | Marcell[ini] |
et Hipp[olyti].¹⁹

Colville was so relentless that he even entered into the catalogue of Agustín's own library next to the chronicle indicated as the work of Marcellinus that this rascal, this old fox had sold the same work to Philip II under a new, false title with the indication of Petrus Alexandrinus' authorship:

Marcellini] Scelus nomine Andreas Darmarius scriptor et veterator
nequissimus qui hunc ipsum codicem descripsit et titulum prostituit
magnificum Marcellini, idem alium codicem descripsit sua propria
manu at prostituit eum Regi Philippo II sub nomine Petri alexandrini
ut scilicet primum (?) scelus lucraretur ex novis et fictis titulis.²⁰

¹⁹ LUNDSTRÖM (n. 8) 161.: "die Randbemerkungen von David Colvillus Scotus' Hand".

²⁰ GRAUX (n. 3) 348. and 462. (in the latter passage we can find *Philippi* instead of *Philippo*). In the last sentence the word *primum* was suggested by Graux. According to Lundström the word *pessimum* should be there (LUNDSTRÖM [n. 8] 162. note 4).

As we could see, in this case the accusation of deliberate forgery is not founded adequately, although we cannot deny that Darmarios tended to manipulate the manuscripts. In forming a judgment, however, we also need to consider that he was primarily active as a bookseller and not as a scribe; copying manuscripts for him was a way of making a livelihood, which was not always lucrative.